

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-15, 20-28, 37, and 42-49 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 15, 37, and 49 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 8, 11, 15, 22, 25, 37, 44, 47, and 49 have been amended, and claims 2-5, 16-19, 29-36, and 38-41 have been canceled herein. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Telephone Interview

Applicants would like to take this opportunity to thank Examiner Lovel for the courtesy of conducting a telephone interview with the undersigned on December 18, 2008. The Examiner was extremely professional and courteous throughout the interview, exemplifying conduct that should be commonplace within the USPTO.

During the interview, the Examiner and the undersigned agreed that the art of record did not include the features that are now recited in independent Claims 1, 15, 37, and 49. However, it was also agreed that an additional, updated search needed to be conducted before a final determination could be made regarding patentability.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-29 and 37-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 6,804,664 (Hartman et al.) and 7,103,605 (Hazi et al.), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115324 (Blumenau et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

During the above-referenced telephone interview it was agreed that neither Hartman et al., Hazi et al., nor Blumenau et al., either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features that are now recited in the independent claims. Thus, because none of the independent Claims is obvious, none of the claims that depend therefrom are anticipated or obvious.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is requested.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1, 15, 37, and 49 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also deemed patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: December 19, 2008

By: /PAUL D. AMROZOWICZ/

Paul D. Amrozowicz

Reg. No. 45,264

(480) 385-5060